

### Remarks/Arguments

On 14 March 2007, after the Applicants had filed the Request for Reconsideration of the same date, the Examiner telephoned the Applicants' attorney saying that all references in the open Office Action to Bridgelall were meant to refer to U.S. Publication 2006/0050667 to Verma et al.

The amendment to the Claims is submitted to improve their clarity and to remove abbreviations.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Verma et al. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection.

The Applicants submit that the cited reference to Verma et al is not available to be cited against the instant application. 35 USC 102(e) specifically states:

"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless the invention was described in an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by ANOTHER filed in the United States....(emphasis added)"

The inventive entity of the instant application is identical to the inventive entity of the cited reference. It is therefore clear that the cited reference is NOT an application by another, as required by 35 USC 102(e), and therefore is not available to be cited against the instant application.

The Applicants submit that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
SHAILY VERMA ET AL.

By: *Catherine A. Ferguson*  
Catherine A. Ferguson, Attorney  
Reg. No. 40,877  
(609) 734-6440

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing LLC  
Two Independence Way, Suite 200  
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

March 20, 2007

kms